Appl. No. 10/032,796
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Goldschlag et al. (U.S. 6,108,644), hereinafter "Goldschlag". The claims are modified in the amendment. More specifically, claim 16 has been added. Therefore, claims 1-16 are present for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

1. Preliminary Amendment: On June 12th, 2002, Applicants submitted a Preliminary Amendment (*See attached* Exhibit 1, Preliminary Amendment). The Amendment broadened claim 1 by eliminating the following element: "logging an error if the identifier is not valid" and placing the limitation in Claim 2.

However, in the Office Action dated March 17, 2005, the Office continued to include the *logging an error if the identifier is not valid* language in its analysis of claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner issue an Office Action with the correct claims in light of the Preliminary Amendment. Applicants believe that because the amendment broadens claim 1, the rejection can still be rebutted under the existing arguments presented by the Office. These arguments are addressed below.

2. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldschlag, et al., Patent No. 6,108,644 (hereinafter "Goldschlag"). A rejection under §102(e) requires that all elements of the claims be disclosed in the cited art. For a valid anticipation rejection, the Office must show that each and every limitation from the claims appears in a single piece of prior art. Applicants believe limitations from independent claims 1 and 11 are not present in Goldschlag. Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, and 12-15 depend from claim 11.

More specifically, Goldschlag cannot be relied on to teach or suggest: (1) issuing a request to provide a *form identifier* that is *associated* with a *form,* as required by claims 1 and

Appl. No. 10/032,796
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2005

PATENT

11, (2) receiving the *identifier* at a host computer, as required by claims 1 and 11; or (3) *verifying* with the host computer whether the *identifier* is a *valid* identifier for the *form* being *used*, as required by claims 1 and 11. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to the claims.

The Goldschlag patent sets forth methods for performing electronic transactions. The audit protocol cited by the office sets forth a procedure to include certain verifying data in an electronic transaction to help protect against fraud (Goldschlag, col. 7, lines 50-64). According to Goldschlag, a vendor receives a transaction request message from a customer with an "audit secret" (Goldschlag, col. 7, line 67). The vendor then sends an "audit request message" to the customer, and receives an "audit response message" from the customer which again includes the "audit secret" information (Goldschlag, col 8, lines 6-11, 58-64). The vendor then compares the "audit secret" information in the transaction request message and audit response message to determine if the transaction request is legitimate (Goldschlag, col 8, lines 16-18, 65-67; col. 9, lines 1-2). The purpose of the audit is to deter illicit sharing of certificates and ensure legitimacy in transactions.

The present claims provide for systems and methods for auditing *forms*, which may help ensure that updated or otherwise valid forms are being used. Such forms may, by way of example, be used for various business transactions or to gather information. Claims 1 and 11 call for receiving a *form identifier* that is *associated* with a *form*. There is nothing equivalent in Goldschlag, as it involves a *transaction*, not a form. The audit secret in Goldschlag is used to ensure that the customer and transaction are legitimate, and an example of an audit secret given in Goldschlag is a credit card number. The audit secret is associated with a particular customer. In the present claims, the form identifier identifies a version of a form, and is associated with a particular form.

Claims 1 and 11 also call for *verifying* with the host computer whether the *identifier* is a *valid* identifier for the *form* being *used*. Again, there is nothing equivalent in Goldschlag, as it involves a *transaction*, not a form. The audit secret in Goldshlag is received twice, and these received audit secrets are compared to determine legitimacy of a transaction

Appl. No. 10/032,796
Amdt. dated June 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2005

PATENT

request. The form identifier in the present claims is merely compared to a database or other listing of identifiers to determine if the identifier is valid for the form being used. Thus, the comparisons made are also quite different.

Goldschlag also fails to include additional limitations. Claim 11 and dependent claim 6 also require that the host computer include an associated database, and that the identifier is verified by comparing the identifier with a list of valid identifiers in the database. Claims 2, and 12 require a terminal having a processor that is in communication with the host computer. Goldschlag does not include either of these limitations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MLD:klb
60484502 v1